

Date: Fri, 16 Apr 93 04:30:17 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #99  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 16 Apr 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    99

Today's Topics:

   1500 watts  
   1500 watts too much?  
   CW = effective utilization?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: 15 Apr 93 22:24:26 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: 1500 watts  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

taber@cimfie.enet.dec.com suggested the electronics manufacturers save their  
\$1 million of internal RFI filtering funds by setting aside perhaps \$5000  
worth of filters to give to those few consumers who DO complain. Let me tell  
you what two manufacturers have done with that "\$5000":

I complained to Panasonic that their fax machine phone unit was picking up  
RFI. Answer? "We're not in the business of giving away filters."

I complained to AT&T Consumer services that two of their phones are picking  
up RFI. The answer? "Sorry, filters are not free. You can buy one at your  
local AT&T Phone Center Store."

I say they just put the filtering in ALL the phones, etc. and be done with  
it. New sources of RFI and EMI are being created all the time, and  
eventually, unfiltered consumer devices may pick up SOMETHING unwanted. (And

I don't mean telephone solicitors.)

Howard

-----  
Date: Thu, 15 Apr 1993 20:11:24 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!srngenprp!alanb@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: 1500 watts too much?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Bill Gunshannon (bill@triangle.cs.uofs.edu) wrote:

: The only justification for having and using 1500 watts is to be louder  
: than the guy next door with 1000 watts. I would personally like to see  
: the limit set at about 500 watts max.

The problem is that would have very little affect on RF interference.  
A 1500 watt signal has only a 1.7 times higher voltage (or current)  
than 500 watts. This might reduce interference slightly, but would  
be very unlikely to eliminate it entirely. Even reducing power by 10  
times (150 watts) would only reduce the voltage by a factor of 3.2.

If you have 3.2 volts of RF on your neighbor's pre-amp input, reducing  
it to 1.0 volts would not likely eliminate the interference.

AL N1AL

-----  
Date: Fri, 16 Apr 1993 00:08:15 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-  
state.edu!csn!csn!stortek!georgen@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: CW = effective utilization?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr13.173936.29352@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com  
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>georgen@stortek.com "George Noyes" writes:

>

>>Well, its real simple..... CW was the FIRST mode of communications used in  
>>radio communications. If it was packet, then maybe packet would be  
>>preferentially treated.

>

>I suspect you are correct, but is that a \*valid\* reason for giving it  
>preferential treatment today? Spark was also the first means of generating  
>RF signals, yet it doesn't receive preferential treatment. Quite to the  
>contrary, it's prohibited.

>

>So what are the underlying principles for a CW requirement? Certainly you  
>aren't suggesting that "being first" is a reasonable principle. Using that  
>principle, we'd all have to learn how to ride a horse before getting a

Well, you're hell bent on flaming the CW guys.....

The point is, the original mode of xmsn began with CW and the rules have continued to reflect this. Is it fair? Maybe not, but life is NOT FAIR... in case you haven't noticed. Is it time to change? Perhaps, but I don't think "packetees" have a "god given right" to abscond all the band allocations from historical operations. I believe that appropriate actions have been and are underway to allow our hobby to "evolve". Witness the new "no code" licensing - i.e. it hasn't been the great "end of the world" for ham radio, but instead a fresh influx of "new blood."

Being "First" is what it is ALL about. If you are FIRST with any idea, NOT MATTER HOW MEDIOCRE, you are liable to gather a great following and become the "standard". (many examples of this are in the computer industry!) If you are not first, but have a good idea, you MIGHT become recognized as a standard when enough people adopt confidence in the idea (i.e. SSB and today's packet predicament). If you are not first, and it is a mediocre idea, you may as well start looking for something else (niche market idea). Once something becomes a standard, "religious belief" overrides "scientific fact" and people begin claiming all kinds of advantages and overlook disadvantages. Packet, believe it or not, is moving into the "religious belief" region, since it has become a "standard", although is not at full acceptance. After all, some of the transmission standards have been entrenched for about 100 years (hard to believe ain't it!).

So where am I going with this babble, you might ask! Packet is still new, CW is firmly entrenched in religious belief, and TIME is the only REAL filter for good and bad ideas. If Packet is as good as everyone thinks, it will slowly become the basis for ham radio.

But, I have to admit, it is gonna be pretty hard to beat a communications signalling technique that requires little to no "technology" to get "intelligent" information to another person under poor channel conditions with an internationally acceptable code, using electronics which are highly fault tolerant, and, considering everything previously stated, been used by megapeople for more than 100 years..... I find it quite hard to say CW is useless and packet deserves the cw allocation or that others should not be atleast exposed to the code....

Lest we all forget: ham radio is a hobby with many facets.

Flame OFF! 73 es hope to see all at Dayton, de George, W1XE

-----  
Date: 15 Apr 93 19:12:19 GMT  
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!ub!dsinc!netnews.upenn.edu!prijat!  
triangle.cs.uofs.edu!bill@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C5ECqK.Hr3@athena.cs.uga.edu>, <11947@prijat.cs.uofs.edu>, <-  
LVV5J0XZ@linac.fnal.gov>an  
Subject : Re: 1500 watts too much?

In article <-LVV5J0XZ@linac.fnal.gov>, carlson@linac.fnal.gov (Kermit Carlson)  
writes:

|> In article <11947@prijat.cs.uofs.edu> bill@triangle.cs.uofs.edu (Bill  
Gunshannon) writes:>  
|> >Can anyone give a legitimate reason for using 1500 watts for a hobby??  
|> >  
|> >bill KB3YV  
|>  
|>  
|> You of course are telling me that my running 1.5K for EME is wrong...  
|>  
|> Kermit W9XA  
|> p.s. care to include EME as legimate use of power?

NO. What possible purpose does it serve other than as a silly game??

NASA did it years ago. What does it accomplish today?? What practical  
use does it provide?? What are you learning that wasn't learned in the  
60's?? It makes about as much sense as using 1500 watts to talk to a  
normally un-inhabited piece of rock in the Pacific Ocean just because  
somebody with money to burn stopped his boat there.

bill KB3YV

--

Bill Gunshannon	"There are no evil thoughts, Mr. Reardon" Francisco
bill@cs.uofs.edu	said softly, "except one; the refusal to think."
	#include <std disclaimer.h>

-----  
Date: Thu, 15 Apr 1993 22:43:02 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!squam.banyan.com!banyan.com!  
dts@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr14.174051.27139@leland.Stanford.EDU>,  
<1993Apr15.143041.3318@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993Apr15.221025.12531@leland.Stanford.EDU>  
Subject : Re: No-code issue

In article <1993Apr15.221025.12531@leland.Stanford.EDU>,  
paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

|> >No that's not the implication at all. MF and HF groundwave range is  
|> >typically better than VHF/UHF line of sight even in daytime. If the  
|> >goal is statewide coverage, the lower HF bands are better than VHF/UHF  
|> >round the clock, though nighttime interference due to skip is a problem.  
|> >Frequency reuse is much more effective in daytime than at night, just  
|> >ask any AM broadcaster. At night, frequency reuse is limited to half  
|> >continent sized zones.  
|>  
|> Well, here in Northern California, we get about the same coverage on 6m  
|> FM repeaters as we do on 40 during the day. Aside from six, most states  
|> have some sort of linked wide area repeater system, that covers at least as  
|> much ground as the low HF bands during the day.

For Civil Defense work, I really prefer the daytime use of 40 and 80 meters.  
Linked repeaters are fine in urban and suburban areas, and when weather does not  
destroy systems. For mountainous terrain, the linked repeater approach is not  
always workable.

We have a linked 440 network in Massachusetts and other parts of New England  
called WorldNet. There used to be an emergency drill net on the network, and I  
think it was generally not workable. The problem is that with the inherent link  
key-up delays of most linked systems, it was difficult to maintain an effective  
directed net.

This approach does require a lot of equipment, on mountaintops, and is more prone  
to failure than an HF rig and a dipole. Here in Massachusetts we use 2 meter  
repeaters, 6 meter repeaters, HF, and government band radio systems for CD work.  
All systems have their places.

|> As to frequency reuse  
|> "by continent" at night, have a listen sometime to all of the European  
|> broadcasters on 40...  
|>  
|> Again, given the limited HF spectrum, it's better to put local (eg, under  
|> 1000 km) traffic on VHF wherever possible.

I guess you are on flat terrain. VHF out to 1000km is not realistic in the  
mountains, unless you are on top of them (and are then a lightning target).

|>  
|> -=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."

|> ->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)  
|>  
|>  
|> --  
|> -=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."  
|> ->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

--

-----  
Daniel Senie                               Internet:       dts@banyan.com  
Banyan Systems, Inc.                    Compuserve:    74176,1347  
508-898-1188                            Packet Radio: N1JEB@WA1PHY.MA  
-----

Date: Thu, 15 Apr 93 22:10:25 GMT  
From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!  
nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C569rq.7L9@squam.banyan.com>,  
<1993Apr14.174051.27139@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993Apr15.143041.3318@ke4zv.uucp>p  
Subject : Re: No-code issue

>No that's not the implication at all. MF and HF groundwave range is  
>typically better than VHF/UHF line of sight even in daytime. If the  
>goal is statewide coverage, the lower HF bands are better than VHF/UHF  
>round the clock, though nighttime interference due to skip is a problem.  
>Frequency reuse is much more effective in daytime than at night, just  
>ask any AM broadcaster. At night, frequency reuse is limited to half  
>continent sized zones.

Well, here in Northern California, we get about the same coverage on 6m  
FM repeaters as we do on 40 during the day. Aside from six, most states  
have some sort of linked wide area repeater system, that covers at least as  
much ground as the low HF bands during the day. As to frequency reuse  
"by continent" at night, have a listen sometime to all of the European  
broadcasters on 40...

Again, given the limited HF spectrum, it's better to put local (eg, under  
1000 km) traffic on VHF wherever possible.

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Just name a hero, and I'll prove he's a bum."

->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Col. Gregory "Pappy" Boyington, USMC (ret)

-----  
Date: Fri, 16 Apr 93 02:31:00 GMT  
From: btree!bly@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr12.210150.15732@ttinews.tti.com>,  
<1993Apr13.184121.16519@btree.uucp>, <1qh5rfINNb4f@mojo.eng.umd.edu>  
Subject : Re: 10meters (Give it to CB)

In article <1qh5rfINNb4f@mojo.eng.umd.edu> chuck@eng.umd.edu (Chuck Harris - WA3UQV) writes:

>In article <1993Apr13.184121.16519@btree.uucp> bly@btree.uucp (Roger Bly) writes:  
>>I think that we should reallocate a big chunk of 10m to CB. And give them  
>>some VHF/UHF also. After all, the "waves" belong to the citizens.

>Gee, and what do you think most of us hams are? WE'RE CITIZENS YOU ASS!

Well, according the "Purpose of Amateur Radio" as codified in part 97, the ham bands are not "citizen's bands". The amateur allocation's scope and purpose are limited (ie. experimentation, public service, international goodwill, no business, etc). The amateur service does not come close to serving all citizens. Of course the users of the amateur service are citizens, but so are the users of the business services. I realize that the FCC is already trying to migrate the amateur bands towards citizen bands by continuing to ease the licensing requirements, allowing personal business, etc. They have publicly stated this intent. That is great, but I think we all would like to see some spectrum remain focused on experimentation, public service, etc. I would rather the new citizen bands be new allocations, but would settle for 10m, etc. being reallocated to CB.

Citizen's bands should be large radio parklands of spectrum set aside for general citizens to use without any content restrictions. This spectrum should serve for personal communications, personal business, and low-level broadcasting. Most importantly, this "parkland" should be available to any citizen; no license required. Of course there would have to be some limits and band plans to avoid total chaos, but the goal should be as little structure as possible.

Remember that the FCC's charter is to "allocate radio spectrum in the greater public's interest...". I think the allocations for public service, business, broadcasting, cellphones, LEO, DBS, amateur, etc. make a lot of sense. However, the allocations for military are much too large, and those for citizen's band are too small. They just don't follow that charter. Everyone I've talked to at the FCC and Congress agrees that there needs to be a change in these areas in this the "decade of mobile communications".

These proposed citizen's bands would not be anything like the 11m band we have today. It can be easily argued that the problems with that band have to do with the psychology of too many people in too small a space and poor band location.

I think we should continue to petition for more citizen bands, otherwise we will be paying \$\$ to use every bit of \*our\* spectrum.

>And as to your fondness for talking with the "bootleggers", they are not in  
>the amateur radio service. Your license doesn't permit you to broadcast,  
>or to communicate with other radio services. (except in the case of an  
>emergency, of course.)

In the name civil disobedience, I'll risk it. :->

-Roger Bly (ka6mwt)  
btree!bly@ucsd.edu

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #99  
\*\*\*\*\*